

Missing Voices in Rediscovering Late Ottoman and Early British Jerusalem

Roberto Mazza

Looking at the vast and conflicting literature about Jerusalem, it soon becomes evident that there are gaps in the historiographic output. The city's transition from Ottoman to British rule is one such omission: very little attention has been paid to that formative period. What are the reasons for this lack of interest? The relative scarcity of works dealing with this era is due to a number of factors, including a lack of political interest in this period, and an arbitrary division of history that fails to take into account both the changes and continuities in this transition. However, in the last decade a number of works were produced that focus on this period, significantly including local voices often overlooked in favor of Western sources only. A discussion of how historical literature on turn-of-the-century Jerusalem is moving forward will afford the opportunity for a reassessment of the field.

There are enough books on the history of Jerusalem to fill entire libraries, and they reflect the city's relevance and prominence. I have argued elsewhere that there are several reasons why the history of Jerusalem attracted and continues to attract so many scholars, writers, and readers.¹ Most of the narratives produced on Jerusalem are employed in making various claims that serve the purposes of those who wish to control the city and monopolize its significations. Books, articles, pamphlets and more recently Web sites and other electronic media have been produced to justify the rule over the city by one group seeking to subjugate others. In Andersonian terms Jerusalem has become an imagined city as there are many groups whose members do not necessarily know each other, but share strong feelings towards the city.² Every community in Jerusalem then is also "imagined," since it is conceived

more as an ideal, with the constituent communities' religious myths being turned into collective memories and transmitted as history. Issam Nassar, in a fascinating article on historical writing and the issue of the often unheard native voice, has noted that narratives produced on Jerusalem's history are in constant competition.³ These narratives connect the city with those groups who share the same history, but keep them divided at the same time, *de facto* isolating the history of different communities from the overall history of the city. These narratives, besides, seem to focus mainly, if not exclusively, on the conflictual relations between the various communities of Jerusalem as if this state of affairs had always existed in history, contributing to a crystallized and rigid understanding of the dynamic relations between these communities.

Is it then possible to write about Jerusalem in the late Ottoman and early British eras without being subservient to a cause or claim? In attempting to answer this difficult question this article will consider three themes dealing with the changing historical narratives produced in the last decade. The first will emerge from a discussion of the war period and the transitional era from Ottoman to British rule. I will argue that the choice of one periodization rather than another is often driven by political, ideological and religious aims. I will show how current literature has introduced the study of the impact of the First World War on Jerusalem and its late Ottoman past, thereby contributing to a bitterly contested re-writing of the history of the city. The second theme is the inclusion of local narratives produced by natives and residents, often neglected by scholars, as the city was being appropriated by others while the indigenous residents were not seriously considered as potential agents of change.⁴ The last theme to be reviewed will be the hitherto ignored sources and non-English narratives. I will show how the former can be crucial in rewriting and rediscovering the history of the city and its inhabitants, and how the interpolation of narratives produced in different languages can substantially alter our understanding of the city and its dynamics. Additionally, a second overall objective of this article is to recall attention to a historical period that was at risk of being erased by competing historical narratives. While discussing these themes, it will also be possible to present an overview of the current literature suggesting avenues for new lines of research, as well as pointing at possible criticisms of this literature.

Periodization: The War and the Transition from Ottoman to British Rule

Periodization is not just a practical or methodological device, dividing time into blocks and making decisions over chronology, but rather a choice of values and, to an extent, of claims. The division of history into periods, in itself, is then not based on facts, but, more likely – as E.H. Carr argues – rests on a necessary hypothesis whose validity depends on interpretation.⁵ If the relatively simple task of dividing time on paper can be considered the practical aspect of periodizing history, what really matters is



Lower David's Street at the turning to the Wailing Wall in Jerusalem's Old City. *Source: Library of Congress.*

giving some meaning to the divisions. While I have no issues with the idea of dividing history, I believe the choice of periodization cannot be driven by simply staking political, ideological, or religious claims. The point put forward here is that perusing the major literature on the history of Jerusalem, it is noteworthy that the whole period of transition from Ottoman rule to British administration, and more specifically the war years between 1914 to 1918, have been almost entirely overlooked. Why has this phase been ignored? This is indeed a key question, which unfortunately can be only partially answered, as many scholars do not discuss their reasons for removing this period. Reasons for the erasure of the War and of Palestine's Ottoman past have been surmised by Salim Tamari, as we will see later in the article.⁶

One general observation I made while examining some important works produced in the past in relation to late Ottoman and early British Jerusalem, such as Haim Gerber's *Ottoman Rule in Jerusalem 1890-1914* and Naomi Shepherd's *Ploughing Sand*, is that it appears not many claims can be made regarding Jerusalem during the First World War.⁷ There is certainly, according to this literature, more to say on the British Mandate era as a whole, on early Jewish immigration, or on rising Palestinian nationalism. Ironically, I believe, the choice to ignore the years of the war clearly shows the lack of attention to the city and its inhabitants: according to this literature, only with the British occupation in December 1917 does Jerusalem regain its prestige; albeit once again as an "imagined" community rather than an urban reality.

This is a problem affecting not only Western scholarship. Salim Tamari argues that one possible reason for the removal of the war period from history is related to the outcome of the war itself. Four centuries of Ottoman rule were quickly erased by most Arab scholars, who began by characterizing the "days of the Turks" as backward and terrible, then focused chiefly on emerging Arab nationalism. Turkish historiography too was no longer as concerned with Ottoman history as it was with the business of writing a new history that would support the emerging Turkish state.⁸ Abigail Jacobson has noted that Ottoman and post-Ottoman eras are treated as two separate entities with very little attention given to the war. She argues that this arbitrary division and the exclusion of the war prevent us from understanding both the continuities and ruptures that occurred in the transition from one imperial rule to another.⁹

This is indeed an artificial and arbitrary division that seems to me to serve the purposes of simplifying history and avoiding some crucial historical questions. A good indication of the necessity of looking at the late Ottoman era and early British rule together, including the war period, is the development of a key concept embedded in the larger process of modernization: citizenship. The very idea that Ottoman residents of Jerusalem could have developed such an idea had been discarded by a large number of professional historians and writers. Martin Gilbert, in one of his numerous works on Jerusalem, claimed that modernity arrived with the British; similarly in the best-selling popular history of Jerusalem by Karen Armstrong it is only with the end of "Turkish" rule that Jerusalem finally saw the light of the modern era.¹⁰ An interesting exception in the best-selling popular history market is the recent work of Simon Sebag Montefiore, *Jerusalem: The Biography*.¹¹



Jerusalem: Jaffa Gate. *Source: Library of Congress.*

Montefiore has vividly portrayed daily life in Ottoman Jerusalem, including Jerusalemites who often in popular history have been forgotten.

The very frequently denied idea of an indigenous modernity has been challenged recently in a number of works. It has emerged that mechanisms of administrative modernity developed throughout the late nineteenth century, and some institutions and practices were then kept by the new imperial power of the British.¹² Despite some setbacks, such as the Young Turks revolution of 1908, Ottoman subjects turned into citizens with representation in the national parliament, producing what Michelle Campos has called “civic Ottomanism,” the idea of an imperial citizenship based on a shared ground of socio-political interaction.¹³

The choice of periodization has far-reaching repercussions not only in the general historical understanding of one single case but also in the larger comprehension of socio-political phenomena such as modernization. There is still a gap, only partially addressed in the works noted above, to be filled in relation to the war period and its formative value. The First World War in general, in particular as a socio-political process, has been discussed in great depth in European historiography, while in the context of the Middle East such scholarship is still in its infancy.¹⁴

The Inclusion of Local Residents

The discussion of periodization leads to the second theme treated in this article. In Jerusalem during the war local issues such as the famine of 1915-16, the invasion of locusts, or the militarization of the local environment overrode international questions like the management of the Holy Places or Jewish immigration. Dominant discourses in earlier, and also contemporary, historical writings in relation to the city, exclude the indigenous population as if these people had nothing to contribute to the history of the city, *de facto* denying them any agency in this formative period. Jerusalemites are rarely placed at the center of attention, and tend to be taken into account only when interacting with Europeans. Dipesh Chakrabarty has made clear that it is impossible to write a “French” social history with Syrian sources: the time has come to incorporate local voices into historical narratives and put an end to their exclusion.¹⁵ But this process on its own could take historiography to the other extreme by excluding Western sources. I would therefore suggest striking the proper balance among all possible voices. Greg Denning, exploring the history of the Pacific Islands, realized the need to include “the land,” “the men,” and “the outsiders” in order to provide less limiting answers to key questions: better answers, if not the whole picture.¹⁶

Since the people of Jerusalem not only represent, but themselves constitute the city, it becomes crucial for contemporary historians to find new sources. Those are mainly letters, diaries and memoirs – which have to be studied and analyzed closely in order to add a new dimension to the historical research so far produced. Diaries and memoirs, for all their limitations, do indeed represent the missing local voices of late Ottoman and early British Jerusalem. The diary of Wasif Jawhariyyeh, a young musician in war-time Jerusalem, challenges the traditional views of late Ottoman Jerusalem as a city already divided along sectarian and communal lines, suggesting a degree of intercommunal interaction often neglected if not denied by previous scholars.¹⁷ The diary and memoirs highlight the complexity of late Ottoman Jerusalem and of the early years of British rule: it is the “men and women” suggested by Denning who finally formulate their definitions of “we” and “they.”¹⁸ Another resident of Jerusalem who left us an important record of wartime Jerusalem is Ihsan Hasan al-Salih Turjman, an ordinary recruit in the Ottoman army. If Jawhariyyeh belonged to the petite bourgeoisie often in touch with the elites of the city, Turjman provides us with what may be considered a subaltern’s chronicle that at this stage of historical research is rather unique.¹⁹ In various ways that mirror their different social backgrounds and personalities, Jawhariyyeh and Turjman provide us with a vast amount of observations on aspects often ignored, such as the collective memory of natural disasters like the invasion of locusts in 1915, and the living conditions of women, the poor, prostitutes and ordinary soldiers. An interesting study, still to be fully exploited, was produced by researchers at Bethlehem University. Under the guidance of Adnan Musallam, history students at Bethlehem University, in 1993, conducted interviews with World War I survivors. This collection is a great rarity, as I am not aware of any other similar project. The

memoirs collected present a fresh picture of the living conditions during the war and introduce oral history as a possible source for a better understanding of the war era.²⁰

Diaries and memoirs of Western residents can also be a valuable source as they shared, to a degree, the same experiences as all other inhabitants. Though there is an abundance of diaries and memoirs of pre-war Jerusalem and indeed of British Jerusalem, not much is available for the war era. In fact, apart from the memoirs of the leader of the American Colony, Bertha Vester Spafford, the only known diary by a Western resident so far is that of Spanish consul Antonio de la Cierva Conde de Ballobar.²¹ The diary itself is a great source for aspects of war-time Jerusalem not covered by Jawhariyyeh and Turjman, and indeed the close relationship between the consul and Jamal Pasha, the Ottoman commander and *de facto* Governor of Syria, is a very interesting element in the chronicle. Furthermore, as I will argue in the next section, merging these narratives can provide a picture of the city never seen before. An interesting perspective on changing Jerusalem as it passed from Ottoman to British rule has been presented by Yair Wallach.²² Wallach traces the trajectories of segregation implemented by the British after 1918 through the eyes of an Orthodox Jew born in the Muslim Quarter of Jerusalem, Gad Frumkin, who rose to become a judge in Palestine's Supreme Court during the British Mandate. Frumkin's memoir is hardly a new source, but what Wallach offers is a different reading with a focus on the recollection of details of late Ottoman and early British Jerusalem, including significant indications of where the city changed and where it did not throughout this formative period.

To include local voices in historical writing is more a necessity than a choice; narratives divorced from the men and the land, to use Denning's jargon, perpetuate what Edward Said exposed more than three decades ago with his *j'accuse* against Orientalism.²³ Jerusalemites have rarely been placed at the center of attention and some narratives even give the impression that the inhabitants of the city were no more than supporting actors or extras performing walk-on parts and cameo roles. Including Jerusalemites in the picture expands both the number and type of sources to investigate, an enrichment any historian should relish. Reservations concerning this approach are more related to the nature of the sources, rather than their usefulness. Diaries and memoirs are indeed partisan sources, but in the particular context of late Ottoman and early British Jerusalem, they do contain much that has been missing for generations in historical writing.

Sources and Narratives

In this last section I will discuss two major issues: the under-utilization of local sources and the insufficient interaction among the historians addressing these issues. In one sense this section summarizes what has been discussed earlier. The majority of works available are based on Western sources including the accounts of Western travelers. In itself this presents no problem, though it certainly imposes a limitation.

But it is the way these sources have been and continue to be used that constitutes an issue. For instance, consular sources have been employed mainly to explain political relations between religious institutions, the development of Zionism and Jewish immigration; information on the local population is scanty and local people are mentioned only in contexts that support the benevolent effect of Western presence. As mentioned earlier a legitimate question to pose would be: how can one write a history of Jerusalem without Jerusalemites, whether they are ordinary folk, Eastern Orthodox monks, local businessmen, or local members of the Ottoman, and later British administrations?

Western sources are indeed useful but not indispensable. Michelle Campos, discussing the meaning of key terms like liberty and citizenship in the late Ottoman Empire, is focused on Palestine, and in particular Jerusalem as a microcosm, to study with the aim of challenging established literature.²⁴ For the purpose of this discussion, what makes her book groundbreaking is the decision not to use British archival sources. Though I would argue that these sources could have been useful, Campos shows that it is not a necessity to use Western sources: she applies Chakrabarty's idea and writes about Ottoman citizens using Ottoman sources. Perhaps less challenging, from the methodological point of view, but still very interesting, is the work by David Kushner on Ali Ekrem Bey, the Ottoman governor of Jerusalem from 1906 to 1908. Kushner highlights a set of sources often unjustifiably disregarded or else unknown to historians: which seems to suggest that many scholars find it easier to deal with more familiar Western sources rather than accepting the challenge of perusing Ottoman ones in Turkish, Arabic, or other languages.²⁵ The autobiography of Selma Ekrem, daughter of the Ottoman governor Ali Ekrem Bey, has found little room in historical narratives, though she has written extensively about her stay in Jerusalem, providing precious details from a unique perspective.²⁶ Similarly, an underestimated source is the collection of articles by Falih Rıfki *Zeytindağı* (Mount of Olives). A famous journalist close to Atatürk, late in 1914 Falih Rıfki joined the army to become the personal secretary of Jamal Pasha in Jerusalem.²⁷ His writings offer significant information about wartime Jerusalem. Contrary to the view that Muslim residents were better off than their Christian counterparts, Rıfki notes that "the people of Jesus are as hungry as the people of Muhammad and are equally doomed to live in misery."²⁸ Of the Jews he had much to say, though mainly about recently arrived European Jews. He was critical of Zionism while also trying to understand it. Indeed *Zeytindağı* is a source that should be more attentively explored.

If sources are the main issue in writing the history of the city, we should also pay attention to historiographic production in languages other than English. Histories of Jerusalem have been produced in many languages, including Hebrew, Arabic, Turkish, German and French, but some of this literature has also been written in Italian and Spanish.²⁹ Although most Israeli and Arab scholars have also published in English, what is really striking, and to an extent worrying, is the general lack of interaction among these narratives and among academics across the cultural and linguistic divide.

In most of the literature available in English it is extremely rare to find references to French, Italian or Spanish works, whilst all of these historical narratives often feel obliged to quote from English-language works, a bow to the current leading academic language. Articles and books by Henry Laurens, Dominique Trimbur, Vincent Lemire, or Catherine Nicault are often unknown or overlooked.³⁰ Indeed, different national narratives have different purposes: the French and the Italians have often focused on their activities in Jerusalem, while the British have focused on Jerusalem the biblical city or on the issue of Zionism. Arab and Israeli scholars have frequently focused on political narratives, often relying on local sources to argue their cases and support their claims, but conversely relying mainly on English narratives for the historical context. Despite all possible attempts at interaction, what remains is an atomized academic field, in which the players are unable to communicate. This landscape therefore appears static, or at the least severely lacking in dynamism. I argue that it is indeed possible and certainly feasible to bring together as many narratives as possible, to explore what they can offer and to attempt to integrate their findings.

One last paragraph should be dedicated to fields to be developed while rediscovering the history of late Ottoman and early British Jerusalem. Despite the amount of work so far carried out, a lot remains to be discovered and discussed. A good example is in relation to the condition of women in Jerusalem. Very little has been written about women: the work by Margaret Shilo on Jewish women in Jerusalem should encourage other scholars to look at other communities and possibly at women across the board.³¹ The field of gender studies is not the only one that still lacks attention. Environmental history, the history of education, and the history of medicine are fields that deserve more attention because through them we may gain a better understanding of the general history of the city and its people during a pivotal period.³² In light of what has been discussed in this article there is also a set of historiographic questions that should be defined and assessed in the long term. How can we look at Jerusalem's history apart from Palestine yet not severed from it? What would be the benefit for scholarly research in isolating Jerusalem? Since many scholars have begun to look at Jerusalem as a microcosm, I believe scholars should discuss what would be the advantages of studying Jerusalem as separated, though not de-contextualized, from Palestine.

To sum up: in the last decade or so new narrative histories of late Ottoman and early British Jerusalem have been produced. competing and challenging previous and contemporary works by, especially, those who do not use history to make sense of our present, but to make claims of their own or to support the claims of others, whether politicians, institutions or private organizations. What I have attempted to show here is that by moving away from traditional periodizations of the history of the city, by including local voices, and by fostering interaction among narratives it is possible to write histories that try to explain the present with a more nuanced picture of the past without being subservient to any cause or claim.

Roberto Mazza is Assistant Professor of Late Ottoman and Modern Middle East History at Western Illinois University and Research Associate at SOAS, University of London.

Endnotes

- 1 R. Mazza, *Jerusalem from the Ottomans to the British* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2009).
- 2 B. Anderson, *Imagined Communities* (London: Verso, 2006), 6.
- 3 I. Nassar, "Jerusalem in the Late Ottoman Period: Historical Writing and the Native Voice," in *Jerusalem Idea and Reality*, ed. T. Mayer and S. Ali Mourad (London: Routledge, 2008), 205-223.
- 4 Nassar, "Jerusalem in the Late Ottoman Period," 205.
- 5 E.H. Carr, *What is History?* (London: Penguin, 1990), 60.
- 6 S. Tamari, "The Great War and the Erasure of Palestine's Ottoman Past", in *Transformed Landscape: Essays on Palestine and the Middle East in Honor of Walid Khalidi*, ed. C. Mansour and L. Fawaz (Cairo: The American University in Cairo, 2009), 105-135.
- 7 H. Gerber, *Ottoman Rule in Jerusalem* (Berlin: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 1985); N. Shepherd, *Ploughing Sand* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 2000).
- 8 Tamari, "The Great War and the Erasure of Palestine's Ottoman Past," 107.
- 9 A. Jacobson, *From Empire to Empire: Jerusalem Between Ottoman and British Rule* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2011), 1.
- 10 M. Gilbert, *Jerusalem in the Twentieth Century* (London: John Wiley & Sons, 1996); K. Armstrong, *Jerusalem: One City, Three Faiths* (London: Harper Collins, 1996).
- 11 S. S. Montefiore, *Jerusalem: The Biography* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2011).
- 12 Mazza, *Jerusalem from the Ottomans to the British*.
- 13 M. Campos, *Ottoman Brothers: Muslims, Christians, and Jews in Early Twentieth-Century Palestine* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2011).
- 14 S. Heydemann, ed., *War, Institutions and Social Change in the Middle East* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000).
- 15 D. Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 27-46.
- 16 G. Dening, *Islands and Beaches: Discourse on a Silent Land: Marquesas 1774-1880* (Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii, 1980), 1-6.
- 17 S. Tamari and I. Nassar, eds., *Ottoman Jerusalem in the Jawhariyyeh Memoirs* (Beirut: Institute for Palestine Studies, 2004), [in Arabic]; S. Tamari and I. Nassar, eds., *British Mandate Jerusalem in the Jawhariyyeh Memoirs 1918-1948* (Jerusalem: Institute for Palestine Studies, 2005), [in Arabic]. A translation of the diary and memoirs is forthcoming from the same editors. Other works discussing Jawhariyyeh are Jacobson, *From Empire to Empire* and S. Tamari, *Mountain Against the Sea: Essays on Palestinian Society and Culture* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009).
- 18 Dening, *Islands and Beaches*, 3.
- 19 S. Tamari, *Year of the Locust. A Soldier's Diary and the Erasure of Palestine's Ottoman Past* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011), on Turjman see also Jacobson, *From Empire to Empire*.
- 20 http://admusallam.bethlehem.edu/bethlehem/my_oral_history_collectionE.htm, last accessed May 2012.
- 21 R. Mazza and E. Manzano Moreno, eds., *Jerusalem in World War I: The Palestine Diary of a European Diplomat* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2011). See also R. Mazza, "Antonio de la Cierva y Lewita: the Spanish Consul in Jerusalem 1914-1919," *Jerusalem Quarterly* 40 (Winter 2010), 36-44; R. Mazza, "Dining Out in Times of War: Jerusalem 1914-1918," *Jerusalem Quarterly* 41 (Spring 2010), 52-58.
- 22 Y. Wallach, "Sharing space in late Ottoman and British Mandate Jerusalem: Segregation and Integration through the eyes of Justice Gad Frumkin," *Conflict in Cities Working Papers Series*, 21, (peer-reviewed, electronic series, <http://www.arct.cam.ac.uk/conflictincities/workingpapers.html>) last accessed May 2012.
- 23 E. Said, *Orientalism* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978); E. Said, *Out of Place* (New York: Knopf, 2000).
- 24 Campos, *Ottoman Brothers*.
- 25 D. Kushner, *To Be Governor of Jerusalem: The City and District During the Time of Ali*

- Ekrem Bey 1906-1908* (Istanbul: The Isis Press, 2005).
- 26 S. Ekrem, *Unveiled. The Autobiography of a Turkish Girl* (New York: Ives Washburn, 1930).
 - 27 F.R. Atay, *Zeytindağı* (Istanbul: Pozitif Yayınları, 2004); G. Lewis, "An Ottoman Officer in Palestine, 1914-1918," in *Palestine in the Late Ottoman Period*, ed. David Kushner (Jerusalem: Ben-Zvi Press, 1986), 402-415.
 - 28 Lewis, "An Ottoman Officer in Palestine, 1914-1918," 408.
 - 29 An interesting work in Turkish has been published by Yasemin Avcı, *Değişim Sürecinde Bir Osmanlı Kenti: Kudus 1890-1914* (Ankara: Phoenix, 2004); indeed Turkish historiographical production should be perused more thoroughly.
 - 30 Here is just an example of non-English literature: H. Laurens, *La Question de Palestine 1799-1922* (Paris: Fayard, 1999); G. Barriuso, *España en la Historia de Tierra Santa* Vol. II (Madrid: Ministerio de Asuntos Exteriores, 1992-94); A. Gabellini, *L'Italia e l'Assetto della Palestine 1916-1924* (Florence: SeSaMO, 2004); C. Nicault, *Une Histoire de Jérusalem 1850-1967* (Paris: CNRS, 2008); V. Lemire, *La Soif de Jérusalem: Essai d'Hydrohistoire 1840-1948* (Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 2011); D. Trimbur and R. Aaronsohn, eds., *De Bonaparte à Balfour: La France, l'Europe Occidentale et la Palestine 1799-1917* (Paris: CNRS, 2001); and V. Lemire, *Jérusalem 1900* (Paris: Armand Colin, 2013).
 - 31 M. Shilo, *Princess or Prisoner? Jewish Women in Jerusalem, 1840-1914* (Waltham, MA: Brandeis University Press, 2005); A. Salam Khalidi, *Memoirs of an Early Arab Feminist* (London: Pluto Press, 2013), S. Hussein Shadid, ed. J.S. Makdisi, *Jerusalem Memories* (Beirut: Naufal, 2000).
 - 32 Though more should be said about medical services provided in late Ottoman Jerusalem, two good works on medicine have been published in 2007, E. Dolev, *Allenby's Military Medicine: Life and Death in World War I Palestine* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2007); Y. Perry, *Modern Medicine in the Holy Land: Pioneering British Medicine Services in Late Ottoman Palestine* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2007). Many works have been written on education starting with the famous book by A.L. Tibawi, *Arab Education in Mandatory Palestine: a Study of Three Decades of British Administration* (London: Luzac, 1956); or the work on Jewish education by E. Manneberg, "The Evolution of Jewish Educational Practices in the Sancak of Jerusalem Under Ottoman Rule," PhD Thesis (University of Connecticut, 1976). The main problem is that no major works have been written in the last decade. The most recent is the PhD thesis written by John Harte, "Contesting the Past in Mandate Palestine: History Teaching for Palestinian Arabs Under British Rule 1917-1948," PhD Thesis (SOAS University of London, 2009).